

## BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT CONFERENCE REPORT

**SUBJECT:** Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** June 2, 5 & 12, 2014

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCE:** John O. Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:**

|                  |                                       |   |                            |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| <b>NHDOT</b>     | David Scott                           | Nik Fiore                               |                            |
| Steve Babalis    | Jerry Zoller                          |   | <b>Pathways Consulting</b> |
| Fred Butler      |                                       | <b>Hartgen Archeological Associates</b> | Ann Kynor                  |
| John Butler      | <b>Federal Highway Administration</b> | Walter Wheeler                          | <b>Town of Hanover</b>     |
| Sheila Charles   |                                       |   | Peter Kulbacki             |
| Victoria Chase   | <b>NHDHR</b>                          | <b>Historic Preservation Consulting</b> | <b>Town of New London</b>  |
| Ronald Crickard  | Laura Black                           | Lyssa Papazian                          | Kim Hallquist              |
| Kevin Daigle     | Edna Feighner                         |   |                            |
| Jillian Edelmann |                                       |   |                            |
| Marc Laurin      | <b>Engineering Ventures</b>           |   |                            |
| William Rose     |                                       |   |                            |
| Bill Saffian     |                                       |   |                            |

*(When viewing these minutes online, click on an attendee to send an e-mail)*

### PROJECTS/PRESENTATIONS REVIEWED THIS MONTH:

*(minutes on subsequent pages)*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| June 2, 2014 .....                          | 1 |
| Hanover 68086, NH-04-0011 .....             | 1 |
| June 5, 2014 .....                          | 3 |
| Stewartstown-Canaan 15838, X-A000(984)..... | 3 |
| June 12, 2014 .....                         | 3 |
| Bedford 13953, X-A000(143).....             | 3 |
| New London 16051, X-A001(111).....          | 4 |

#### June 2, 2014

#### **Hanover 68086, NH-04-0011**

**Participants:** Nik Fiore, Engineering Ventures; Peter Kulbacki, Town of Hanover; Walter Wheeler, Hartgen Archeological Associates; Fred Butler, NHDOT

Continued consultation on the proposed Hanover Mobility Hub design. This project was reviewed outside of the regular Cultural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting, but included in this document for logistical purposes of minutes tracking.

- 1.0 The intent of this meeting was to discuss the second draft of the Modified Area Form prepared by Hartgen Associates, address comments provided on the form, discuss the proposed design for Project 2, and come to an agreement on the effects of Project 2.
- 2.0 Modified Project Area Form  
Meeting opened with a review of comments provided by L Black. There was confusion

as to what was being asked for versus what was provided. In L Black's view the modified Area Form focused too much on the buildings around the Green individually, and not enough statements were included that address the Green and adjacent buildings as a whole.

*[Note: Part of the confusion came from different definitions for the phrase "from a building" in reference to view sheds. While not explicitly agreed upon during the meeting N Fiore suggests that henceforth the design team's definitions be carried forward. Views "from a building" will mean outward views from within a building(s). Views from outside a building(s) will be referred to as views from in front of buildings or from front yards. Referring to the two types of view sheds by different names to reduce further confusion.]*

- 2.1 L Black would like revisions to the modified Area Form to provide more commentary on the APE as a whole. L Black described what she was looking for and W Wheeler expressed that he likely had all of the information and would not need to conduct additional research or site visits.
- 2.2 W Wheeler and L Black will conduct follow up discussions.
- 2.3 W Wheeler to revise modified Area Form based on feedback from this meeting and the follow up discussions.
- 3.0 Proposed Bus Shelter and Kiosk  
N Fiore noted that due to a number of factors the scope of the project has been reduced from the 2013 concept to just the shelter and kiosk and that all work will be within the E. Wheelock Street ROW.
  - 3.1 Comments on the proposed shelter and kiosk were generally positive. Both J Edelman and L Black commented that the current plan is a better alternative to the 2013 concept. They like the shape, scale, and form of the shelter and find the use of glass and metal framing to be unobtrusive.
  - 3.2 J Edelman asked if work includes planting trees or installing pavers (details for both were shown in the provided plans). N Fiore stated that those details are carryovers from the Project 1 plans and those elements will not be part of Project 2.
- 4.0 Findings  
J Edelman stated that she believes that enough information has been provided to make a "No Adverse Effects" determination for the project. All meeting attendees agreed.
  - 4.1 J Edelman will draft the letter of determination and distribute.
  - 4.2 W Wheeler's revised modified Area Form will be required prior to issuing final letter of determination. [Note that receipt of the revised form was not received prior to DHR's concurrence of the project effect finding, however it was noted in DHR's concurrence letter to FTA (dated June 27, 2014) that it was expected that FTA would ensure submission of the revised form.]

June 5, 2014

**Stewartstown-Canaan 15838, X-A000(984)**

**Participants: David Scott, Bill Saffian, Marc Laurin, Kevin Daigle, Jerry Zoller, NHDOT**

Continued consultation on the red listed bridge over the Connecticut River (054/163) specifically for the proposed rail options. Discussion included crash tested rails that would be suitable for the historic bridge.

Bill Saffian discussed his investigation of the rail options that would be suitable and would be acceptable to the Vermont AOT. There is no room to place both a crash rail and an aesthetic rail on the bridge. The Department proposes to use T3 rail similar to that used in Franconia Notch with balustrades attached to the back side of the rail. Balustrades can be fabricated to be similar to the existing with a tube on top and across the bottom. J. Zoller explained that these elements could be fabricated as panels and bolted onto the back side of the rail. Each balustrade would need to be welded to the tubes, would be galvanized and open-ended. The result will be that the rail would not visually be as open from the roadway side as existing. Dave Scott stated that a detail will be worked up for review. DHR asked DOT to continue working on the aesthetic aspects of the design to create an option that is as “open” and similar to the existing rail as possible.

Laura Black asked about the FHWA 1992 Summary Report on Aesthetic Rail. J. Zoller discussed that 1992 was the beginning of testing for aesthetic rails, since then approved rails are mostly concrete and not suitable for the bridge. Also bridge rails need to be TL4 crash tested and this eliminates most of the currently approved aesthetic rails. L. Black stated her concerns with the view through the proposed rail from the road and if the view looking at the bridge from shore would be similar to the existing. J. Zoller showed a picture of the Echo Lake rail and will provide a picture of this rail that shows the view from the back side (*these were subsequently forwarded to DHR on June 6<sup>th</sup>*).

Marc Laurin provided more photos of the church, the church hall and a 1950's residence on Church Street to augment the RPR form. An archaeologist will be sent to survey the area. L. Black asked that the relationship of the church and hall to the store, that was shown on historic maps to be located on the north side of Church Street, and to the former bridge crossing must be part of the survey.

June 12, 2014

**Bedford 13953, X-A000(143)**

**Participants: Steve Babalis, John Butler, Victoria Chase, Marc Laurin, NHDOT**

Continued consultation to determine effects and mitigation options pertaining to the 2 mile widening and reconstruction of NH Route 101 to provide two lanes in each direction, a raised median with openings for turns, shoulders acceptable for bicyclists and sidewalks where appropriate from Constitution Drive westward to Wallace Road.

John Butler showed the revisions to the design that relocated the proposed sidewalk from Nashua Road to Constitution Drive to the south side of the highway. This resulted in some reductions to the impacts to the Bedford Center Historic District. In order to limit impacts to 2 Liberty Hill Road (Parcel 43) the alignment was shifted to the north, resulting in the same impacts as previously shown to the contributing properties at 14, 20 and 24-26 Bedford Center road properties (Parcels 53, 50 and 46). The impacts to 30 Bedford Center Road (Parcel 42) are reduced. The pavement will be removed from the discontinued portion of Liberty Hill Road.

The alignment on Meetinghouse Road is slightly reduced with no acquisition needed at 7 and 11 Meetinghouse Road (Parcels 27 and 28), though minor slope work will still occur. Further survey will be conducted, but it is anticipated that the small trees on 11 Meetinghouse Road will not be impacted by this slope work. There will be strip acquisition along 10 Meetinghouse Road (Parcel 29), but they do not extend to the NR-Listed portion of the property (Town Hall). The stormwater treatment area east of the Meetinghouse Road intersection has not been designed, but will impact 62 Bedford Center Road (Parcel 35) and 10 Meetinghouse Road (Parcel 29) and the non-contributing property at 111 Route 101 (Parcel 36). The detention basin could extend about 40 feet from the existing right-of-way onto these properties.

Laura Black expressed concerns with the possible noise and view shed impacts to the 14, 20 and 24-26 Bedford Center road properties (Parcels 53, 50 and 46), and 2 Liberty Road (Parcel 43). John Butler stated that vibration monitoring will be provided during construction and the owners will be provided with the Contractor's contact. Due to concerns of the enhanced views of the highway or trucks on raised sections of roadway, L. Black asked that renderings of visual impacts at these properties be made as they would be beneficial in evaluating effect. J. Butler explained that the profile change will be 5 feet at most, and that the existing slope or vegetated ledge cut will not be impacted. He asked if view shed impacts could result in an Adverse Effect to the District. L. Black did not think so, but renderings are needed to verify that it would not. Jill Edelmann suggested that photographs from the properties be marked up to represent the elevation changes, and that cross-sections of this area would help in showing the impacts. L. Black stated that there is a need to show that the impacts would not rise to an adverse effect. J. Butler made the point, and L. Black agreed, that as the properties front Bedford Center Road this would be another point in establishing the argument that the view shed impacts are not adverse.

### **New London 16051, X-A001(111)**

**Participants: Ann Kynor, Pathways Consulting LLC; Lyssa Papazian, Historic Preservation Consulting; William Rose, NHDOT**

Continued consultation on the Elkins Road/Wilmot Center Road Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements Transportation Project, which consists of the construction of approximately 2,800 linear feet of new sidewalk, new crosswalks, drainage improvements, improvements to the intersection, bridge alterations, and reclamation and repaving. The goal of the meeting was to review requested supplemental information for impacts and alternatives.

Jill Edelmann (JE) explained that the Historic District Area (HA) Form was reviewed at the Determination of Eligibility meeting on June 11, 2014 and there was a consensus that it is eligible as a historic district. Additional information is needed regarding contributing and non-contributing elements of the resources.

Lyssa Papazian (LP) asked what the questions pertained to.

Laura Black (LB): A variety of issues will be on the "green sheet," the response form from the Determination of Eligibility Committee (DOE) that will be issued by Mary Kate Ryan. The reviewer needed more information. Under normal circumstances the "identification" step of the Section 106 process (Determinations of Eligibility) would be completed and finalized before the Section 106 process proceeds to the "assessment of [adverse] effect" step (taking place during this meeting). But in this case, due to the funding deadline of the TE grant, we will work through both processes concurrently. The HA Form will need to be amended to address the missing content and be resubmitted for review at another DOE meeting. We may have to make

conservative assessments (in the cultural resources review process) if there is a question regarding whether an element is contributing or not.

Ann Kynor (AK): There are eight contributing road and drainage related features in the HA Form. Ann distributed a memorandum that presented alternatives to the impacts that are proposed in the vicinity of each of the following contributing resources.

#### **Boat Ramp and Associated Walls, Slab, and Block Walls**

AK: This resource will not be impacted by the project. The project will add a pull-off shoulder to improve access to the boat ramp by vehicles towing trailers. Ann spoke with Jamie Sikora about the boat ramp and the town park, both of which are Section 4(f) lands and are owned by the Town. The Town has written a letter (copy provided in the memo) supporting the proposed work adjacent to these Section 4(f) properties.

#### ***Elkins Road Bridge (at Pleasant Lake Dam)***

AK: The original plan was to remove the concrete parapets and replace them with T4 guard rail. However, the HA Form identified the parapets as a defining feature of the contributing resource, so the project team identified various options for adjusting the roadway and sidewalk widths to preserve the concrete parapets on the bridge deck. The preferred plan is to rebuild the parapets and move the downstream parapet further southeast (downstream) several inches to allow for a wider sidewalk that will meet current ADA requirements.

LB: By removing the original parapets and replacing them in a slightly different location, you are minimizing the impacts. Adding a railing on top of the parapet to meet the 3' 6" required height for a pedestrian railing is also minimization. It is a discussion of what is best for all. There should be an attempt to make the railing unobtrusive (i.e. with paint or in style). The panel details on the parapets should be kept.

LP: The parapets should not overhang the bridge deck because they are currently recessed from the bridge deck. The amount of the recess could be modified to allow for a wider sidewalk. The dimensions of the concrete "girder" along the outside bottom of the parapets should be kept.

William Rose (WR): How does this change affect the project cost?

AK: We have not estimated the construction cost for the new parapets, but the overall project cost cannot increase from the current budget.

WR: The project costs are close. William warned the Town to not make promises it cannot keep. Tradeoffs may need to be made to stay within budget.

Edna Feighner (EF): The Town should also keep in mind the cost of mitigation if the Town does not select the minimization measures. Mitigation could be even more expensive.

#### ***Raised Roadway (Elkins Road) Between Lake Outlet and Millpond on West***

AK: The project proposes to replace the existing sidewalk with a wider sidewalk and replace the metal pipe railing with a T4 railing that meets current safety standards for vehicles and pedestrians.

Kim Hallquist (KH): The pipe railings used to be wooden railings. The Road agent has worked for the Town for 40 years and recalls when the wooden railings were replaced with the pipe railings, sometime in the 1980s.

JE: The railings are not character-defining to the contributing feature. They are a modern element. It is important to make a new rail compatible with the historic area. So the fancy balustrade railing that is shown in the photograph of the New Durham bridge (in the memo) is not compatible as there is no precedent for that type of railing. The choice will be the Town's, but the Town should be as sensitive to the area as it can. For example, the Manchester Street Bridge is a T4 bridge, but it was painted black in an attempt to help it blend in with the area.

AK: The project proposes to patch the deteriorated concrete on the retaining walls.

LB: Suggested patching it with a compatible material that will adhere to the old concrete and will match in color.

***“Tannery” Millpond On Blackwater River (Headwaters) Outflow, Including Stone Retaining Walls on the North and the South Banks***

AK: The project proposes to remove and replace a small section of the stone retaining wall on the north side of the millpond to install a new drainage culvert. The resident engineer could be required to take photographs before and after construction to document that the stones were replaced to best match pre-construction conditions.

LB: The culvert is modern, and replacing the stones as described is good. There were no concerns with this proposed impact.

***Concrete U-Shaped Rigid Frame Culvert (7') on Elkins Road...Near Sherman Street and JJ. Raised Roadway (Elkins Road)***

AK: The project proposes to remove the existing sidewalk and pipe railing and build a new, wider concrete sidewalk and a T4 guard rail. The existing railing is modern (non-contributing) and does not meet current safety standards.

LB: Were the railings replaced at the same time as the Elkins Road bridge railings?

KH: We think so.

LP: We found no historic images of this bridge with the railing. We are not sure about the age of the crib walls, but presumed that the cribs were build when the bridge was.

LB: If the railing is modern, then it should be considered in the same manner as the railing at the Elkins Road Bridge, that is, select the least obtrusive style for the new railing. Laura suggested reducing the sidewalk and/or road dimensions so that the outside edge of the new sidewalk is flush with the outer face of the crib wall and bridge deck.

AK: There are four cast or ductile iron drain pipes that drain the roadway and protrude from the concrete retaining wall. The project proposes to keep them or if needed, to replace them in kind and in the same location, but to improve the inlets by connecting them to a single shallow yard drain that will be located in the road at the low point in the road. This will provide a proper inlet that will not clog so frequently.

LB: It is good that the existing pipes will be kept and the new inlet will be connected to them.

***Steel I-Beam with Concrete Deck Bridge, (NHDOT 173/096) Elkins Road Over Blackwater Brook***

AK: This bridge and the stone headwalls will not be impacted. An independent, prefabricated pedestrian bridge is proposed to cross the river and the contributing resource will not be impacted.

***Granite Posts (Several Locations)***

AK: The granite posts along the project corridor will not be impacted.

***Stone Retaining Walls (Several Locations)***

AK: The stone retaining walls along the project corridor will not be impacted.

EF: The project is being very sensitive to the resources and it shows that the Town cares about the historic resources.

KH: The neighbors want the sidewalks but they would like everything else to stay exactly as it is. It is a conservative neighborhood.

LB: If there is no history of granite curbing, then adding granite curbing may not be historically sensitive, or vice versa.

AK: There is some granite curbing along the project corridor, so we are matching the existing character, but we will remove the old deteriorated sidewalk in some areas where the new sidewalk is proposed on the opposite side.

LB: Keep in mind that some new concrete sidewalks are bright white and distract from the character of the area. The overall redesign has helped a lot and can be argued to have no adverse effect. The Town needs to document that what it is proposing is not adverse. For example, the Town should note where it is trading modern for modern; in kind replacement; or replacement matches the dimensions and physical characteristics of the original resource. The railing on top of the concrete parapet is a change but it is for a safety reason. The alternative of building a taller parapet would change the look of the parapet and would be a worse alternative.

LB asked if there has been community involvement, as their input is important. The Town should provide meeting minutes from the public meetings in the documentation.

KH: The Town has had several public meetings and has been consulting with the Town Archivist throughout this process. No one has voiced concern over the proposed impacts

to the concrete parapets or the other historic resources. The neighborhood was in favor of the previously proposed plan to remove them.

LB: Are there any alternatives to the T4 railing that is less obtrusive and more in keeping with the character of the neighborhood?

JE: It is acceptable for the Town to submit a draft No Adverse Effects memo with supporting documents to Jill for review. The draft will be distributed to the Jamie Sikora and the DHR for review, and the final will be signed and will be provided to the Town for inclusion in the NEPA documentation.

[Post meeting follow-up: continued coordination regarding the determination of eligibility indicated that the two bridge structures could potentially be individually eligible for the National Register. With information and a final determination still outstanding, the two structures needed to be considered individually eligible and evaluation of adverse effect related to those resources, as well as the historic district, was necessary.]

*(When viewing these minutes online, click on a project to zoom to the minutes for that project)*

Submitted by: Sheila Charles and Jill Edelman, Cultural Resources

<http://www.nh.gov/dot/org/projectdevelopment/environment/units/technicalservices/crmeetings.htm>